Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/593,071	ROUGEOT ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	DONG JIANG	1646
All Participants:	Status of Application:	
(1) <u>DONG JIANG</u> .	(3)	
(2) <u>Vincent Shier</u> .	(4)	
Date of Interview: 13 January 2011	Time:	
Type of Interview: Telephonic Video Conference Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative) Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes If Yes, provide a brief description:		
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed:		
Claims discussed:		
claims 1, 3, 15 and 16		
Prior art documents discussed:		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: See Continuation Sheet		
Part III.		
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above. 		
/Dong Jiang/		
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1646	applicant/Applicant's Representat	ive Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed:

The examiner contacted the applicant, discussing potentially allowable subject matter, and remaining issues, with suggestions of claim amendment. The examiner indicated that 1) claim 1 recites "A peptide that is a maturation product of the human BPLP", however, the required SEQ ID NO:6 is not such a product as X1-X2 may not be part of the original human BPLP sequence according to the limitation, and the peptide is modified; 2) claim 3 recites " wherein said metallo-ectopeptidase is NEP or APN", however, NEP is neutral endopeptidase (see specification, page 2, line 22), not ectopeptidase, and APN (aminopeptidase) is an exopeptidase, but not a metallo-ectopeptidase; thus, changes are needed for both claims 1 and 3; and 3) similar amendment is needed for claims 15 and 16. Applicants agreed with the examiner's suggestions.